

Application No. 10/710,867  
Docket No. A4-1812  
Amendment dated November 23, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2005

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-20 of the above-identified US Patent Application, with the result that the specification and all claims were objected to, but otherwise the claims were deemed to recite allowable subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended the specification and claims as set forth above. More particularly:

The title of the invention has been amended at page 1 of the specification so as to be more descriptive of the invention recited in the pending claims.

The specification at paragraph [0011] has been amended to correctly note that Figure 1 illustrates the prior art.

Independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to clarify whether the registration marks (124) are compared to each other or compared to something extraneous to the claims. Support for these amendments can be found in Applicants' specification at the fourth sentence of paragraph [0018].

Independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been further amended to insert the term "severed" before "lengths" in the paragraphs following the step/means for severing the lengths.

Dependent claim 3 has been amended to cancel a code inadvertently

Application No. 10/710,867  
Docket No. A4-1812  
Amendment dated November 23, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2005

created when the application was converted during the electronic filing process.

Applicants believe that the above amendments do not present new matter. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Objection to the Specification**

The Examiner objected to the specification for containing a title not adequately descriptive of the claimed invention, and for lacking page numbers.

In response to the objection to the title, Applicants have revised the title essentially as suggested by the Examiner.

In response to the objection regarding the lack of page numbers, Applicants' application was filed electronically and the USPTO authoring software (not Applicants) automatically places the page numbers in the upper righthand corner of each page, as evidenced by the first page of Applicants' application attached hereto. Because the pages are numbered on Applicants' copy of the application, Applicants believe the Examiner's copy of the application should be identically numbered, since both Applicants' copy and the Examiner's copy were simultaneously authored by the same USPTO software.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the

Application No. 10/710,867  
Docket No. A4-1812  
Amendment dated November 23, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2005

grounds for objection, or otherwise respectfully ask that the Examiner address the page numbering issue through an Examiner's Amendment or with USPTO personnel responsible for the USPTO authoring software.

### **Objections to the Claims**

The Examiner objected to independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 on the basis that clarification was necessary as to whether the registration marks (124) on the webs (110,112) are compared to each other or compared to something extraneous to the claims. As indicated above, Applicants have amended the independent claims in a manner that Applicants believe addresses the Examiner's concern for clarity, and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of this basis for the objection to the claims.

Under the objection, the Examiner also suggested that the term "severed" be inserted before "lengths" in each of independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 to clarify that the lengths in question were severed in the preceding step. As Applicants have complied with this suggestion, withdrawal of this basis for objecting to the claims is also respectfully requested.

Finally, an objection directed at dependent claim 3 is believed to be overcome by the amendment as described above. Therefore, Applicants also respectfully request withdrawal of the third basis for the objection to the claims.

Application No. 10/710,867  
Docket No. A4-1812  
Amendment dated November 23, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2005

**Closing**

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all issues outstanding from the Office Action have been addressed, and therefore respectfully request that their patent application be given favorable reconsideration.

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Gary M. Hartman  
Reg. No. 33,898

November 23, 2005  
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.  
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383  
TEL.: (219) 462-4999  
FAX: (219) 464-1166

Attachment: Copy of the First Page of the Specification

# SPECIFICATION

Electronic Version 1.2.8

Stylesheet Version 1.0

## WEB FINISHING METHOD AND SYSTEM

### Cross Reference to Related Applications

This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/481,188, filed August 7, 2003.

### Background of Invention

#### Field of The Invention

[0001] [0002] The present invention generally relates to printing equipment and processes. More particularly, this invention relates to a web finishing system suitable for use in inline and offline finishing systems in which multiple webs are simultaneously processed.

### Description of The Related Art

[0002] [0003] In a typical inline printing and finishing apparatus used in the printing industry, a single paper web passes through a series of printing presses at high speeds before being printed (wetted), dried and cooled, after which the web undergoes a secondary finishing operation such as folding, perforating, gluing, die cutting and rotary cutting the printed web to a desired length. The speed at which a web can be printed and dried is typically higher than the speed at which finishing operations can be performed, such that the web finishing operation may artificially limit the speed at which finished printed material can be produced. As such, there are circumstances in which an offline web finishing system is desired.

[0003] [0004] If an offline web finishing system is used, printed webs are rewound at the end of the printing press line to form a preprinted roll ready for a secondary offline finishing operation. In the process of rewinding a preprinted web, it is difficult to maintain an even level of tension throughout the entire rewound web, even though the tension of the web is monitored through extreme care. Relatively small changes in web tension can cause significant print variation of the repeat length of a web's print image, which typically comprises multiple images that repeat as a set along the length of a printed web. Because paper is sensitive to environmental conditions such as humidity, another problem that arises with rewound webs is that during storage, the printed image may shrink, expand or do both within the same rewound web, depending on the conditions